1	THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
3	
4	
5	W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his) capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL) OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and)
6	OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE) ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,)
7	in his capacity as the) TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES)
8	FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)
9	Plaintiff,)
10	vs.) 4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ
11	TYSON FOODS, INC., et al,
12	Defendants.)
13	
14	
15	MOTION FOR
16	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION HEARING
17	
18	BEFORE THE HONORABLE GREGORY FRIZZELL
19	
20	VOLUME I
21	Daily Copy Transcript
22	
23	February 19, 2008
24	
25	

2

3

1 Suite 900 Oklahoma City, OK 73102 2 Mr. John Tucker 3 FOR CARGILL: Ms. Leslie Southerland 4 Attorneys at Law 100 West 5th Street 5 Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103 6 FOR SIMMONS FOODS: Mr. John Elrod Ms. Vicki Bronson 8 Attorneys at Law 211 East Dickson Street 9 Fayetteville, AR 72701 10 FOR PETERSON FARMS: Mr. Scott McDaniel Mr. Philip Hixon 11 Ms. Nicole Longwell Attorneys at Law 12 320 South Boston 13 Suite 700 Tulsa, OK 74103 14 FOR GEORGE'S: Mr. Woodson Bassett 15 Mr. James Graves 16 Mr. Paul Thompson Attorneys at Law 17 221 North College Fayetteville, AR 72701 18 Mr. Robert Sanders 19 FOR CAL-MAINE: Attorney at Law 2000 AmSouth Plaza 20 P. O. Box 23059 Jackson, MS 39225 21 22 23 24

> TULSA FREELANCE REPORTERS 918-587-2878

25

		71
1	scientists. And it strikes me, Your Honor, that	
2	this court should let these agencies do their work.	
3	They're not in here. Department of Health is not in	
4	here as a party. Agriculture department is not in	
5	here as a party. DEQ is not in here as a party. If	11:02AM
6	there was really this imminent and substantial risk	
7	of harm in this watershed, the DEQ would have	
8	stopped the application of poultry litter. DEQ	
9	would have issued swimming advisories that haven't	
10	been done. They would have stopped and written	11:02AM
11	letters to the well owners saying don't drink out of	
12	your well water. We think it has bacteria in it and	
13	that is a substantial risk to your health. No well	
14	owners have received any such letters, and the	
15	Department of Health would be conducting an	11:03AM
16	investigation into this public alleged public	
17	health crisis, which, of course, they're not doing.	
18	Finally, Your Honor, I would simply say the	
19	courtroom is not the proper place to investigate the	
20	public health crisis. That's the Department of	11:03AM
21	Health, and the courtroom is not the proper place to	
22	conduct the TMDL study. Leave that with the EPA and	
23	the DEQ. Let the real agencies that are designated	
24	to do this work do their work. Your Honor, we ask	
25	that the injunction be denied. Thank you, Your	11:03AM

		1055
1	MR. BULLOCK: It's also beyond the scope.	
2	I was getting it from two places here.	
3	THE COURT: Sustained.	
4	MR. ELROD: Your Honor, I guess my point is	
5	that if that's the state's position, we've disposed,	11:03AM
6	perhaps, with a great deal of issues in this	
7	lawsuit, if their position is that litter is not a	
8	hazardous substance, then that's great.	
9	THE COURT: It's just beyond the scope of	
10	the testimony of this witness, I believe.	11:03AM
11	MR. BAKER: Just to be clear, Your Honor,	
12	we have not said that poultry waste is not a	
13	hazardous substance. We're talking RCRA now, solid	
14	waste versus hazardous waste. Very different	
15	concept.	11:03AM
16	THE COURT: You've educated me. I	
17	appreciate that. I still frankly need some	
18	education from both of you on that. It's an	
19	interesting legal issue, but in any event, Mr.	
20	Bullock's objection is sustained.	11:03AM
21	Q Dr. Taylor, in the conduct of your	
22	investigation of the poultry industry, have you	
23	become aware that most of the contracts, all of the	
24	contracts offered by my client, Simmons Food, are	
25	for at least seven years duration?	11:04AM

		1360
1	you to address it. I'm not going to make a ruling	
2	on it, but because at least right now, that is on	
3	the forefront of my mind because as I referenced	
4	before, without deciding at this juncture, just to	
5	let everyone know the hills they have to climb, it	01:31PM
6	seems to me that under RCRA this is likely solid	
7	waste. That's on one side.	
8	On the other, in trying to follow the	
9	application of the rules given to me and tested over	
10	time, I don't know that I can give great weight, and	01:32PM
11	I think that's probably the way that one has to look	
12	at it in terms of a motion for preliminary	
13	injunction. I don't believe it is an exclusionary	
14	device, and if you have any authority, Mr. Jorgensen	
15	or Mr. Bullock in support of what I'm saying. Upon	01:32PM
16	reflection over the noon hour, in the context of a	
17	motion for preliminary injunction, it goes to the	
18	weight, so Mr. Jorgensen.	
19	MR. JORGENSEN: In terms of your question	
20	about authority, in our brief we set out in a	01:32PM
21	footnote that you're exactly right. In the context	
22	of a bench hearing all of the Daubert standards	
23	apply, but the court can hear it all and then decide	
24	what weight to give it. You don't need to enter a	
25	formal order excluding. You can choose not to rely	01:33PM